

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

---

**BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

---

LAM RESEARCH CORP.,

Petitioner

v.

DANIEL L. FLAMM,

Patent Owner

---

U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 E

Issued: April 29, 2008

Named Inventor: Daniel L. Flamm

Title: MULTI-TEMPERATURE PROCESSING

---

Case IPR2015-1764

Patent RE40,264 E

**PETITIONER'S REPLY**

Mail Stop: PATENT BOARD  
Patent Trial and Appeal Board  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE CHALLENGED CLAIMS ARE UNPATENTABLE .....	4
A. Ground 1: Claims 27, 28, 30, 33, 35-39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 51-54, 66, 67, and 69 are Rendered Obvious by Tegal in View of Matsumura and Narita under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	4
1. The Petition Shows that the Combination of Tegal, Matsumura and Narita Teaches All the Limitations of Independent Claim 27 .....	5
a) Tegal and Matsumura Teaches Changing the Temperature Within a Preselected Time .....	5
b) The Petition Did Not Impermissibly Split the Wherein Clause Limitation.....	8
2. The Combination Uses Matsumura’s Controller and Matsumura’s Control Recipes in the Tegal System .....	11
3. The Petition Shows a POSA Would Have Reasons to Combine Tegal, Matsumura, and Narita .....	15
4. The Petition Shows Independent Claim 37 is Obvious Over Tegal in View of Matsumura, and Narita.....	17
5. The Petition Shows Independent Claim 51 Is Obvious Over Tegal in View of Matsumura, and Narita.....	21
6. The Petition Shows Dependent Claims 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52-54, 66, 67, and 69 Are Rendered Obvious by Tegal, Matsumura, and Narita .....	21
B. Ground 2: Claim 29 Is Rendered Obvious by Tegal in View of Matsumura, Narita, and Ooshio under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) .....	21

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Allied Erecting and Dismantling Co., v. Genesis Attachments, LLC</i> , Slip Op. No. 15-1533 (Fed. Cir. June 13, 2016).....	2
<i>CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.</i> , 349 F.3d 1333 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	10
<i>In re Etter</i> , 756 F.2d 852, 859 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	2
<i>Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City</i> , 383 U. S. 1 (1966).....	11
<i>In re Keller</i> , 642 F.2d 413 (C.C.P.A., 1981) .....	2, 14
<i>KSR Int’l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> , 550 U.S. 398 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>MCM PORTFOLIO LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 812 F. 3d 1284 (Fed. Cir. 2015) .....	10
<i>In re Mouttet</i> , 686 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2012) .....	2, 14
<i>In re Ochiai</i> , 71 F.3d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1995) .....	10
<i>Sakraida v. Ag. Pro., Inc.</i> , 425 U.S. 273, <i>reh’g denied</i> , 426 U.S. 955 (1976) .....	3
<i>In re Sneed</i> , 710 F.2d 1544 (Fed. Cir. 1983) .....	2

**Statutes**

35 U.S.C. § 103 ..... 11  
35 U.S.C. § 103(a) ..... 1, 4, 21

**Rules and Regulations**

37 C.F.R. § 42.104(b)(4)..... 8, 9

**EXHIBIT LIST**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Description</b>
1001	U.S. Patent No. RE40,264 (the '264 patent)
1002	European Patent Application Number 90304724.9 (Tegal)
1003	U.S. Patent No. 5,151,871 (Matsumura)
1004	U.S. Patent No. 4,913,790 (Narita)
1005	U.S. Patent No. 4,645,218 (Ooshio)
1006	Declaration of Joseph L. Cecchi, Ph.D.
1007	American Heritage Dictionary, Third Edition, 1993
1008	Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition, 1993
1009	Curriculum Vitae of Joseph L. Cecchi, Ph.D.
1010	'264 Patent Prosecution History, 7/25/2005 Applicant's Response
1011	Daniel L. Flamm and G. Kenneth Herb, "Plasma Etching Technology – An Overview" in <i>Plasma Etching, An Introduction</i> , Dennis M. Manos and Daniel L. Flamm, eds. (Academic Press, San Diego, 1988)
1012	J.W. Coburn and Harold F. Winters, <i>Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology</i> , 16, (1979)
1013	Declaration of Morgan Chu In Support of LAM's Unopposed Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
1014	Declaration of Talin Gordnia In Support of LAM's Unopposed Motion for <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> Admission
1015	Declaration of Joseph L. Cecchi, Ph.D. in support of Reply

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.